



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/767,792

01/23/2001

Craig A. Lewis

07703-327001 / WCR0117

2248

26211

7590

06/29/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
CITIGROUP CENTER 52ND FLOOR  
153 EAST 53RD STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-4611

EXAMINER

CHAMPAGNE, DONALD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,792

Applicant(s)

LEWIS ET AL.

Examiner

Donald L. Champagne

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 49-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48, 71 and 72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group A, claims 1-48, 71 and 72 in a reply filed on 11 April 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is first on the grounds that all the claims have been twice rejected on essentially the same grounds of rejection. That two non-final rejections have been mailed suggests that something was deficient with one or both of them. The rules of practice allow restriction at any time in the prosecution history precisely to correct such deficiencies.
2. Applicant notes further that the claims have not been amended so as to require separate searches. That is correct, but irrelevant. The examiner has shown that the two groups of claims constitute distinct inventions under the criteria given by MPEP § 806.05(e). Having done that, the examiner is required to show one of the requirements (A)-(C) given in MPEP § 808.02. The examiner has done that by showing (A), that the inventions defined by the two groups of claims would be separately classified. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
3. Claims 49-70 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention.
4. Applicant also notes disagreements (p. 2 of 3, first three para.) with comments made in para. 4 of the 1 April 2005 Office action. Applicant's criticism has merit. The subject para. 4 was written as supplementary explanation after the examiner had made only a preliminary review of the application. In retrospect, para. 4 does not accurately reflect the instant invention and should not be construed as imposing any limitations on the instant invention.
5. It is also noted that the "B" and "A" at line 2 of para. 2 of the 1 April 2005 Office action should be reversed.

### *Claim Objections*

6. Applicant is advised that should claims 17 and 40 be found allowable, claims 18 and 41 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to

Art Unit: 3622

object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. "A validated card" is indefinite. – The validated card – would be definite and overcome this rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30-41, 44, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nicholson (US006332128B1).

11. Nicholson teaches (independent claims 1 and 25) a method and article comprising a computer-readable medium for providing discounts for items in an automatic transaction

machine, the method comprising: validating cash or a card (to purchase items at *HVR POS terminal 11*, col. 5 lines 21-24) and validating a separate discount means provided by a user (*frequent shopper card or magnetic medium such as a prepaid card*, col. 4 lines 40-60) at *gasoline station 12*, which, with *HVR POS terminal 11*, comprises the automatic transaction machine (para. 10-12 below), wherein the discount means has an associated discount value (*discount credits*, col. 3 line 57, and *total PPU discount*, col. 5 lines 24-26); detecting a selection of an item or a group of items (*gasoline*), each having a preset vending price (*the normal price*), and discounting the vending/normal price of the item or a group of items according to the discount value (col. 6 lines 29-31).

12. Interpretation of "automatic transaction machine" Unless a term is given a "clear definition" in the specification (MPEP § 2111.01), the examiner is obligated to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of the specification, and consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach (MPEP § 2111). An inventor may define specific terms used to describe invention, but must do so "with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision" (MPEP § 2111.01.III). A "clear definition" must establish the metes and bounds of the terms. A clear definition must unambiguously establish what is and what is not included. A clear definition is indicated by a section labeled definitions, or by the use of phrases such as "by xxx we mean"; "xxx is defined as"; or "xxx includes, ... but does not include ...".
13. The instant application contains no such clear definition for the phrase "automatic transaction machine". The phrase is supported by various embodiments, but these are examples, and do not meet the requirements for a "clear definition." Hence, the examiner is required to give the term its broadest reasonable interpretation, which the examiner judges to be any mechanized transaction system. The mechanized transaction system taught by Nicholson reads on an "automatic transaction machine".
14. This interpretation is based first on the broadest applicable definition of "automatic", which is *done or produced as if by machine; mechanical* (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary). Hence any machine is "automatic". The examiner also considered the definition of the common "ATM", where the "automated" refers to replacing the function of the teller (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary). The reference invention also teaches automatic steps explicitly (e.g., col. 7 lines 5-8 and 58-59).

Art Unit: 3622

15. Nicholson also teaches at the citations given above claims 2, 3, 15, 16, 21, 26, 39, 44, 71 and 72 (where *a frequent shopper card or other magnetic medium such as a prepaid card reads on a token*).
16. Nicholson also teaches: claims 5, 7, 8, 12, 28, 30, 31 and 35 (col. 7 lines 36-38); claims 9-11, 13, 14, 32-34, 36 and 37 (col. 3 line 67 to col. 4 line 34); and claims 17, 18, 40 and 41 (col. 7 lines 22-32).
17. Claims 4, 6, 19, 20, 22-24, 27, 29, 42, 43 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Nicholson.
18. Nicholson does not teach (claims 4, 6, 27 and 29) not returning the discount means (frequent shopper card) and returning the discount value in cash. The former would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, if the means/card was reported lost or stolen. Giving the discount value as cash would have been obvious when the system was not functioning and the customer had to seek product at another establishment.
19. Nicholson does not teach (claims 19 and 42) calculating the discount value as a fraction of the vending price. Because some customers can be expected to want to see their discount as a percentage savings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add calculating the discount value as a fraction (percentage) of the vending price to the teachings of Nicholson.
20. Nicholson does not teach (claims 20 and 43) that the loyalty card/discount means contains the discount value. Because it would permit transfer of customer data between stores without a network, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add to the teachings of Nicholson that the loyalty card/discount means contains the discount value.
21. Nicholson does not teach (claims 22-24 and 45-48) recording the number of customer visits and paying a bonus on that basis. Because these features would enhance the customer loyalty program taught by Nicholson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add to the teachings of Nicholson recording the number of customer visits and paying a bonus on that basis.

### **Conclusion**

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
23. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 5 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at [donald.champagne@uspto.gov](mailto:donald.champagne@uspto.gov), and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.
25. The examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3622

27. **AFTER FINAL PRACTICE** – Consistent with MPEP § 706.07(f) and 713.09, prosecution generally ends with the final rejection. Examiner will grant an interview after final only when applicant presents compelling evidence that “disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration” (MPEP § 713.09). The burden is on applicant to demonstrate this requirement, preferably in no more than 25 words. Amendments are entered after final only when the amendments will clearly simplify issues, or put the case into condition for allowance, clearly and without additional search or more than nominal consideration.
28. Applicant may have after final arguments considered and amendments entered by filing an RCE.
29. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant's intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office's web site, [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov). At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.

**DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Donald L. Champagne  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3622

24 June 2005